

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-11 and 14 remain in the application. Claims 12-13 have been previously cancelled. Claim 9 has been allowed.

In the third paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1, 5-6, 8, and 14 have been rejected as being anticipated by Schmid et al. (German Patent Application Publication DE 197 43 770 A 1) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The Schmid et al. reference is owned by the corporate assignee of the instant application and Applicant is therefore very familiar with this reference.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1 and 14 call for, inter alia:

a second printing machine having a sheet delivery and at least one zoneless metering device for uniformly metering at least one of ink and varnish, respectively, over a printing width. (Emphasis added.)

Initially, it is noted that the Examiner totally ignored Applicant's arguments with regard to US Patent No. 6,101,944 to Schmid et al., which claims priority of the German Patent Application cited in this Office action. Applicant's remarks were made on pages 3-4 of the response to the previous Office action dated March 17, 2003. Since these two documents are substantially identical, the arguments presented in the response to the previous Office action dated March 17, 2003 are also valid with regard to the rejections in this Office action.

As discussed in the response to the previous Office action dated March 17, 2003, Schmid et al. (German Application Publication No. DE 197 43 770 A1) has already been mentioned on page 2, line 7 of the specification of the instant application. In Schmid et al., the reference sign "60" refers to an inking unit (see column 10, line 22). It is not a metering device, let alone a zoneless metering device. A person skilled in the art might assume that the inking unit 60 contains a metering device. However, a person skilled in the art would not assume that the metering device is specifically

a zoneless metering device. From the technical circumstances of the printing machine system described in Schmid et al., one skilled in the art would only assume that the inking unit 60 contains a metering device with divided ink zones rather than a zoneless metering device.

Clearly, Schmid et al. do not show "a second printing machine having a sheet delivery and at least one zoneless metering device for uniformly metering at least one of ink and varnish, respectively, over a printing width", as recited in claims 1 and 14 of the instant application.

Claims 1 and 14 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over Schmid et al. and since claims 5-6 and 8 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In the second paragraph on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 2 and 3 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Schmid et al. in view of Kolbe et al. (US Pat. No. 6,016,748) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As discussed above, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the art. Since claims 2-3 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In the last paragraph on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 4 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Schmid et al. in view of Hofmann et al. (US Pat. No. 5,503,674) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As discussed above, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the art. Since claim 4 is dependent on claim 1, it is believed to be patentable as well.

In the first paragraph on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 7 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Schmid et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As discussed above, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the art. Since claim 7 is ultimately dependent on claim 1, it is believed to be patentable as well.

In the second paragraph on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 10 an 11 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Schmid et al. in view of Rodi (US Pat. No. 5,115,741) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As discussed above, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the art. Since claims 10-11 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's statement in the third paragraph on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action that claim 9 is allowed. It is noted that the Office Action Summary page did not indicate that claim 9 is allowed. Correction of the Office Action Summary page is therefore requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8, 10-11, and 14 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the

Applic. No.: 09/688,463
Amdt. Dated October 8, 2003
Reply to Office action of July 18, 2003

Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


For Applicant

LAURENCE A. GREENBERG
REG. NO. 29,308

YHC:cgm

October 8, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101